REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 8, 2007.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 11, 18 and 20 are amended, claims 6-7 and 16-17 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-15 and 18-20 remain pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, and in particular on page 18, line 14 to page 21, line 12. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced with the amendments.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks **Victor Cheung** as well as Supervisory Examiner **John Hotaling**, for the courtesy of a personal interview on **July 26, 2007** with Applicant's representatives **Rodney Lacy and Michael Blankstein.**

Applicant's representative presented new proposed amendments and discussed how the claimed invention distinguishes over Gatto et al. (U.S. 6,916,247). No agreement regarding the status of the claims was reached during the interview. The Examiner indicated that further consideration and a new search would be required regarding the subject matter in the proposed amendments.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-5 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-33 and 35 of copending Application No. 10/788,903 (1842.020US1).

Claims 1-7, 10-17, and 20 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 12, 14-20, and 25 of copending Application No. 10/802,699 (1842.030US1).

In view of the amendments to claims, Applicant does not admit that a case of obviousness-type double patenting exists with respect to claims 1-7, 10-17 and 20. Applicant will consider filing a terminal disclaimer when all other issues related to the patentability of the claims have been resolved.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-9 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,916,247). Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim*." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 and 11-19 as amended are not anticipated because the claims contain elements not found in Gatto.

For example, claim 1 recites "sending service information for the event management service from the event management service to a discovery agent on the gaming network." Claim11 recites similar elements regarding a service sending service information to a discovery agent. Applicant has reviewed Gatto and can find no disclosure of a service sending service information about the service to a discovery agent on a gaming network.

Further, claim 1 recites "determining by the discovery agent if the event management service is authentic and authorized." Claim 11 recites similar language with respect to a discovery agent authenticating and authorizing an event management service. Applicant has reviewed Gatto and can find no teaching or suggestion of authenticating and authorizing a service such as an event management service. Further, there is no disclosure in Gatto of a discovery agent that authenticates and authorizes a service for a gaming network.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 11 recite elements that are not taught or suggested by Gatto. Therefore claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated by Gatto. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2-5 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and claims 12-15 and 18-19 depend from claim 11. These dependent claims inherit the elements of their respective base claims 1 and 11 and are not anticipated by Gatto for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gatto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,916,247) as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Atkinson et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0142744).). In order for a *prima facie* case of obviousness to exist, three base criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *M.P.E.P.* § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are not obvious in view of the combination of Gatto and Atkinson because the claims as amended contain numerous elements not found in the combination.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 11. These dependent claims therefore inherit all of the elements of their respective base claims, including elements directed to sending service information to a discovery agent and verifying by the discovery agent that the event management service is authentic and authorized for the gaming network. As discussed above, Gatto fails to teach or suggest these elements. Additionally, Applicant has reviewed Atkinson and can find on teaching or suggestion of sending service information to a discovery agent or verifying by the discovery agent that the event management service is authentic and authorized for the gaming network. As a result, the combination of Gatto and Atkinson fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's claims 10 and 20, including inherited elements. Therefore claims 10 and 20 are not obvious in view of Gatto and Atkinson. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 20.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have addressed every assertion made in the Office Action. Applicant's silence regarding any such assertion does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record are relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 373-6954 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER W. BLACKBURN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6954

Date September 10, 2007 By /Rodney L. Lacy/
Rodney L. Lacy
Reg. No. 41,136

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 10th day of September 2007.

Rodney L. Lacy /Rodney L. Lacy/

Name Signature